## NAGEL RICE, LLP

COUNSELLORS AT LAW

ARUCE H. NAGEL® JAY J. RICE" ROBERT H. SOLOMON BARRY M. PACKIN DIANE E. SAMMONS

103 EISENHOWER PARKWAY ROSELAND, NEW JERSEY 07068 (973) 6(8-0400

FAX: (973) 616-6194

www.nagelrice.com

RANDEE M. MATLOFF CLLIOTT LOUIS PELLS ANDREW L. O'CONNOR 290 PARK AVENUE GREG M. KOHN

HARRY A. MARGOLIS ((626-2002)

119 MAPLE AVENUE RED BANK, NJ Q7701 (732) 633-0900

PLEASE SEPLY TO ROSELAND OFFICE NEW YORK, NY IOISE (2(2) \$5(-1485

MICHAEL R. FELDMAN ACCURATION BY THE SUPPRINC COURT OF

HERBERT I. WALDMAN+D

COUNSEL

LORI L MAYERO

SMEMBER OF MJ. & NY. BARS

NEW JERSEY AS A CIVIL TRIAL ATTORNEY DECETIFIED BY THE SUPREME COURT OF NEW JERSET AS A GRIMMAL TRIAL ATTORNEY

December 1, 2009

(Via Facsimile 609-989-0435)

The Honorable Tonianne J. Bongiovanni United States Magistrate Judge Room 6052 Clarkson S. Fischer Federal Building & US Courthouse 402 E. State Street

RECEIVED

DEC - 1 2009

WILLIAM T. WALSH

Scottsdale Insurance Company

v. Somerville Fidelco Associates, LP and Badger Roofing Company Inc. Civil Action No. 3:07-cv-02763(AET)(TJB)

Dear Judge Bongiovanni:

Trenton, New Jersey 08608

The undersigned represents Somerville Fidelco Associates, LP in the above referenced matter. Pursuant to my telephone conversation with Your Honors chambers, please allow this correspondence to serve as my request to obtain leave to file a brief in excess of the 30-page limit imposed by L. Civ. R. 7.2.

We are in the process of preparing opposition papers in response to three separate motions for summary judgment filed by three different insurance carriers who are parties to this litigation. In each case the insurer contends that they had no obligation to provide insurance coverage to Somerville Fidelco Associates, LP and/or Badger Roofing. Rather than burdening the Court with three separate briefs containing duplicative material regarding the legal standard, procedural posture of this case and factual summary, the undersigned intends to present one brief. We will of course provide a separate counter-statement of material facts responding to each movant's papers.

Consequently, we ask for permission to file a brief not exceeding 60 pages in length, rather Court than filing 3 separate briefs, which could total 90 pages without permission from the Court.

I have obtained consent to exceed the page limit from counsel for each of the movants.

So Ordered this \_\_\_\_day